

DRAWING AMENDMENTS

FIG. 1 has been corrected to overcome the objections. Pursuant to the Examiner's request, names of individual components in the figure have been added. A replacement sheet of FIG. 1 is provided after Page 11 of this paper, to be in compliance with 37 CFR 1.84(c).

REMARKS

Amendments

Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 7-9, and 23, in order to further clarify the claimed invention.

Claims 1-4, 7-9 and 11-23 are Allowable

Claims 1-4, 7-9, and 11-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,798,767 to Alexander, *et al.*, (“Alexander”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

With respect to paragraphs 2-3 of the Office Action, none of the cited references, including Alexander, disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 1. For example, none of the cited references, including Alexander, disclose or suggest receiving a query on behalf of a device of a second managed IP network, wherein the query seeks appropriate connection information for a called device associated with a first managed IP network. In contrast to Claim 1, Alexander discloses a call manager associated with a single internet protocol (IP) network, which contains mapping tables and alternate number lists associated with a communication network. (Alexander, col. 8, lines 47-8; FIG. 2). The mapping tables disclosed by Alexander associate telephone numbers on a PSTN network with corresponding IP addresses. (Alexander, col. 10, lines 50-55; FIGS. 4A and 4B). The alternate number lists associate a single target device with additional devices that a call manager rings with specific delay times. (Alexander, col. 10, lines 50-55; FIG. 3). The call manager references the mapping tables and alternate

number lists, in order to route calls over a single IP network to a target device and also to the listed alternate devices. The call manager of Alexander does not receive a query from a device of a *second* IP network that is external to the IP network with which the call manager is associated. As a result, Alexander does not teach or disclose each and every element of Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 is allowable.

Similarly, none of the cited references, including Alexander, disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 7. For example, Alexander does not disclose a network interface engine operable to receive a query on behalf of a device of a *second* managed IP network. In contrast to claim 7, Alexander teaches alternate number lists that associate destination devices on a single IP network. A call manager uses these lists to ring telephone devices on such single IP network. For at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 7 is also allowable.

None of the cited references, including Alexander, disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 15. For example, Alexander does not disclose querying an information store associated with a network, determining that the information store does not comprise a set of connection information, and then querying another device that maintains information regarding more than one managed IP network, for the connection information. In contrast to Claim 15, the mapping tables and alternate number lists disclosed and illustrated by Alexander are located within its call manager device. Alexander does not disclose or teach determining that an information store does not comprise a set of connection information and querying a mediation server for the connection information. Thus, Alexander does not teach or disclose each and every element of Claim 15, and Claim 15 is allowable.

None of the cited references, including Alexander, disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 23. For example, Alexander does not disclose computer instructions to

receive a query on behalf of a device of a *second* managed IP network, wherein the query seeks appropriate connection information for a called device associated with a *first* managed IP network. In contrast to Claim 23, Alexander teaches alternate number lists that associate destination devices on a single network. A call manager uses these lists to ring multiple telephone devices on such single IP network. For at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 23 is allowable.

Because independent claims 1, 7, 15 and 23 are allowable, each of the dependent claims is also allowable. In addition, the dependent claims include further features not found in the cited references. For example, none of the cited references, including Alexander, disclose or suggest initiating communication of connection information of a device associated with a *first* managed IP network, to an address of a device associated with a *second* managed IP network, wherein the address is associated with a query for the connection information. (see claims 2, 9 and 19). For this additional reason, claims 2, 9 and 19 are allowable. Thus, claims 1-4, 7-9, and 11-23 are allowable over Alexander.

Applicant's Claims 5, 6 and 10 are Allowable

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 5, 6, and 10 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander in view of Donley, *et al.*, US Publ. 2004/0180646 ("Donley"). Applicant has shown that independent claims 1, 7, 15 and 23, are patentably distinguishable from Alexander. As explained above, none of the cited references, including Alexander and Donley, teach the specific combinations of independent claims 1, 7, 15 or 23. As such, all of the dependent claims, including 5, 6 and 10, are in condition for allowance. In addition, Donley does not disclose receiving a request to modify a collection of connection information on an information store that comprises connection information for more

than one managed IP network. (see claims 5, 6 and 10). In contrast, Donley only discloses the use of authentication to set preferences on an individual device, such as a telephone. As a result, Donley does not teach or suggest receiving a request to modify a collection of connection information on an information store that comprises connection information for more than one managed IP network. Thus, for these additional reasons, claims 5, 6 and 10 are allowable over Alexander, in view of Donley.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the application and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney or agent.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

07-05-2005
Date

Chad M. Herring
Chad M. Herring; Reg. No. 41,067
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5452 (fax)